arXiv:math/0511250v4 [math.DS] 16 Apr 2006

FIXED POINT INDICES AND PERIODIC POINTS OF HOLOMORPHIC MAPPINGS

GUANG YUAN ZHANG

Abstract. Let Δ^n be the ball $|x| < 1$ in the complex vector space $\mathbb{C}^n$, let $f : \Delta^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a holomorphic mapping and let M be a positive integer. Assume that the origin $0 = (0, \ldots, 0)$ is an isolated fixed point of both f and the M-th iteration f^M of f. Then for each factor m of M, the origin is again an isolated fixed point of f^m and the fixed point index $\mu_{f^m}(0)$ of f^m at the origin is well defined, and so is the (local) Dold's index (see [6]) at the origin:

$$P_M(f,0) = \sum_{\tau \subset P(M)} (-1)^{\#\tau} \mu_{f^{M:\tau}}(0),$$

where $P(M)$ is the set of all primes dividing M, the sum extends over all subsets τ of $P(M)$, $\#\tau$ is the cardinal number of τ and $M : \tau = M(\prod_{p\in\tau} p)^{-1}$.

$P_M(f,0)$ can be interpreted to be the number of periodic points of period M of f overlapped at the origin: any holomorphic mapping $f_1 : \Delta^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ sufficiently close to f has exactly $P_M(f,0)$ distinct periodic points of period M near the origin, provided that all the fixed points of f_1^M near the origin are simple. Note that f itself has no periodic point of period M near the origin.

According to M. Shub and D. Sullivan's work [11], a necessary condition so that $P_M(f,0) \neq 0$ is that the linear part of f at the origin has a periodic point of period M. The goal of this paper is to prove that this condition is sufficient as well for holomorphic mappings.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Counting periodic points by the Möbius Inversion Formula.**

To introduce Dold's index, we first present a formula for counting periodic points. Let E be a finite set and let h be a mapping from E into itself. Then, for each positive integer m, the m-th iteration h^m of h is well defined by $h^0 = id$, $h^1 = h, \ldots, h^m = h \circ h^{m-1}$, successively. An element $p \in E$ is called a *periodic point* of h with *period* m_0 if $h^{m_0}(p) = p$ but $h^m(p) \neq p$ for $m = 1, 2, \ldots, m_0 - 1$. Thus, the period is the smallest positive integer m_0 such that $h^{m_0}(p) = p$.

For each positive integer m, we denote by $\mathrm{Fix}(h^m)$ the set of all fixed points of h^m, by $\mathcal{L}(h^m)$ the cardinality of $\mathrm{Fix}(h^m)$ and by $\mathcal{P}_m(h)$ the number of all periodic points of h with period m. For a given positive integer M, let us derive the expression of the number $\mathcal{P}_M(h)$ in terms of the numbers $\mathcal{L}(h^m)$.

For each factor M' of M and each $p \in \mathrm{Fix}(h^{M'})$, p must be a periodic point of period m for some factor m of M' (see Lemma 4.4). Thus

$$\mathcal{L}(h^{M'}) = \sum_{m|M'} \mathcal{P}_m(h), \text{ for all } M' \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } M'|M, \tag{1.1}$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32H50, 37C25.

Project 10271063 and 10571009 supported by NSFC.

where $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of all positive integers, the notation $M'|M$ indicates that M' divides M and, for each M', the sum extends over all factors m of M'. Then we can solve the system (1.1) of linear equations with unknowns $\mathcal{P}_m(h), m|M$. By the famous Möbius Inversion Formula (see [8]), the solution for $\mathcal{P}_M(h)$ can be expressed in terms of the numbers $\mathcal{L}(h^{M'})$ with $M'|M$ as

$$\mathcal{P}_M(h) = \sum_{\tau \subset P(M)} (-1)^{\#\tau} \mathcal{L}(h^{M:\tau}), \tag{1.2}$$

where $P(M)$ is the set of all primes dividing M, the sum extends over all subsets τ of $P(M)$, $\#\tau$ is the cardinal number of τ and $M : \tau = M(\prod_{p\in\tau} p)^{-1}$. Note that the sum includes the term $\mathcal{L}(h^M)$ which corresponds to the empty subset $\tau = \emptyset$. If $M = 12 = 2^2 \cdot 3$, for example, then $P(M) = \{2, 3\}$, and

$$\mathcal{P}_{12}(h) = \mathcal{L}(h^{12}) - \mathcal{L}(h^4) - \mathcal{L}(h^6) + \mathcal{L}(h^2).$$

1.2. **Fixed point indices of holomorphic mappings.** Let $\mathbb{C}^n$ be the complex vector space of dimension n, let U be an open subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $g \in \mathcal{O}(U, \mathbb{C}^n)$, the space of holomorphic mappings from U into $\mathbb{C}^n$.

If $p \in U$ is an isolated zero of g, say, there exists a ball B centered at p with $\overline{B} \subset U$ such that p is the unique solution of the equation $g(x) = 0$ (0 is the origin) in $\overline{B}$, then we can define the *zero order* of g at p by

$$\pi_g(p) = \#(g^{-1}(q) \cap B) = \#\{x \in B; g(x) = q\},$$

where q is a regular value of g such that $|q|$ is small enough and $\#$ denotes the cardinality. $\pi_g(p)$ is a well defined integer (see [9] or [14] for the details).

If q is an isolated fixed point of g, then q is an isolated zero of the mapping $id - g : U \to \mathbb{C}^n$, which puts each $x \in U$ into $x - g(x) \in \mathbb{C}^n$, and then the *fixed point index* $\mu_g(q)$ of g at q is defined to be the zero order of $id - g$ at q :

$$\mu_g(q) = \pi_{id-g}(q).$$

If q is a fixed point of g such that $id - g$ is regular at q, say, the Jacobian matrix $Dg(q)$ of g at q has no eigenvalue 1, q is called a *simple* fixed point of g. By Lemma 2.2, a fixed point of a holomorphic mapping has index 1 if and only if it is simple.

Actually, the zero order defined here is the (local) topological degree, and the fixed point index defined here is the (local) Lefschetz fixed point index, if g is regarded as a continuous mapping of real variables. See the Appendix section for the details.

1.3. **The local Dold's indices for holomorphic mappings.** Let Δ^n be the ball $|x| < 1$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\Delta^n, \mathbb{C}^n)$. If the origin $0 = (0, \dots, 0)$ is a fixed point of f, then for any positive integer m, the m-th iteration f^m of f is well defined in a neighborhood V_m of the origin.

Now, let M be a positive integer and assume that the origin is an isolated fixed point of both f and f^M. Then for each factor m of M, the origin is an isolated fixed point of f^m as well and the fixed point index $\mu_{f^m}(0)$ of f^m at the origin is well defined. Therefore, we can define the (local) *Dold's index* [6] similar to (1.2):

$$P_M(f, 0) = \sum_{\tau \subset P(M)} (-1)^{\#\tau} \mu_{f^{M:\tau}}(0). \tag{1.3}$$

The importance of this number is that it can be interpreted to be the number of periodic points of f of period M overlapped at the origin:

For any ball B centered at the origin, with $\overline{B} \subset \Delta^n$, such that f^M has no fixed point in $\overline{B}$ other than the origin, any $f_1 \in \mathcal{O}(\Delta^n, \mathbb{C}^n)$ has exactly $P_M(f,0)$ mutually distinct periodic points of period M in B, provided that all fixed points of f_1^M in B are simple and that f_1 is sufficiently close to f, in the sense that

$$||f - f_1||_{\Delta^n} = \sup_{x \in \Delta^n} |f(x) - f_1(x)|$$

is small enough (see Corollary 2.1 (iii) and Lemma 2.4 (ii)).

Note that f itself has no periodic point of period M in $\overline{B}$. This gives rise to an interesting problem:

Problem 1.1. *What is the condition under which $P_M(f,0) \neq 0$?*

By Corollary 2.4, this is equivalent to ask

Problem 1.2. *What is the condition under which there exists a sequence of holomorphic mappings $f_j : \Delta^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ such that*
(1) f_j uniformly converges to f in a neighborhood of the origin, and
(2) each f_j has a periodic point of period M converging to the origin as $j \to \infty$?

According to M. Shub and D. Sullivan's work [11], a necessary condition such that $P_M(f,0) \neq 0$ is that the linear part of f at the origin has a periodic point of period M (see Lemma 2.6 and its consequence Lemma 2.7 (i)). The term "linear part" indicates the linear mapping $l : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$,

$$l(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = (\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{1j} x_j, \ldots, \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{nj} x_j),$$

where $(a_{ij}) = Df(0) = (\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j})|_0$ is the Jacobian matrix of f at the origin.

The goal of this paper is to prove that this condition is sufficient as well:

Theorem 1.1. *Let M be a positive integer and let $f : \Delta^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a holomorphic mapping such that the origin is an isolated fixed point of both f and f^M. Then*

$$P_M(f,0) > 0 \tag{1.4}$$

if and only if the linear part of f at the origin has a periodic point of period M.

When $M = 1$, this theorem is trivial, since any linear mapping has a fixed point at the origin and by the assumption on f and Lemma 2.2, $P_1(f,0) = \mu_f(0) > 0$. When $M > 1$, by Lemma 2.5, the conclusion in Theorem 1.1 can be restated as:

Corollary 1.1. *$P_M(f,0) > 0$ if and only if the following condition holds.*

Condition 1.1. *There exist positive integers $m_1, \ldots, m_s$ ($s \leq n$) such that their least common multiple is M and that $Df(0)$ has eigenvalues that are primitive m_1-th, ..., m_s-th roots of unity, respectively.*

A complex number λ is called a primitive m-th root of unity if $\lambda^m = 1$ but $\lambda^j \neq 1$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1$. Simple examples show that the sufficiency in Theorem 1.1 fails when the mapping f is not holomorphic.

For positive integers $n_1, \ldots, n_k$, their least common multiple will be denoted by $[n_1, \ldots, n_k]$. A linear mapping that has periodic points of periods $n_1, \ldots, n_k$ must have periodic points of period $[n_1, \ldots, n_k]$. From this fact and Theorem 1.1, we can conclude directly that if a holomorphic mapping has periodic points of periods $n_1, \ldots, n_k$ overlapped at a fixed point, then it has periodic points of period $[n_1, \ldots, n_k]$ overlapped at that fixed point, say precisely, we have:

Corollary 1.2. *Let $f : \Delta^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a holomorphic mapping such that the origin is an isolated fixed point of $f, f^{n_1}, \dots, f^{n_k}$, where $n_1, \dots, n_k$ are positive integers. If $P_{n_j}(f, 0) > 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$, and if the origin is an isolated fixed point of $f^{[n_1,\dots,n_k]}$, then*

$$P_{[n_1,\dots,n_k]}(f, 0) > 0.$$

Now, let $M \in \mathbb{N}\backslash\{1\}$ ($\mathbb{N}$ is the set of all positive integers) and let $f : \Delta^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a holomorphic mapping such that the origin is an isolated fixed point of both f and f^M, and that $Df(0)$ satisfies Condition 1.1. We shall make some remarks on the inequality (1.4).

When $n = 1$, (1.4) is known, and can be deduced as follows. In this case, Condition 1.1 means that $Df(0)$ is a primitive M-th root of unity, and then, for each $j = 1, \dots, M - 1$, the origin is a simple zero of the one variable holomorphic function $x - f^j(x)$, which implies $\mu_{f^j}(0) = 1$. Therefore, (1.3) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} P_M(f, 0) &= \mu_{f^M}(0) + \sum_{\substack{\tau \subset P(M) \\ \tau \neq \emptyset}} (-1)^{\#\tau} \\ &= \mu_{f^M}(0) + \sum_{k=1}^{\#P(M)} (-1)^k \begin{pmatrix} k \\ \#P(M) \end{pmatrix} = \mu_{f^M}(0) - 1, \end{aligned}$$

and then (1.4) is equivalent to

$$\mu_{f^M}(0) - 1 > 0. \tag{1.5}$$

On the other hand, since $(Df^M)(0) = (Df(0))^M = 1$, the origin is a zero of the holomorphic function $x - f^M(x)$ with order at least 2. Thus, (1.5) holds. In fact, in this case $\mu_{f^M}(0) = kM + 1$ for some positive integer k (see [10]).

When $n = 2$, (1.4) follows from a result obtained by the author in [14]: the sequence in Problem 1.2 exists when $Df(0)$ satisfies Condition 1.1. For $n = 2$, Condition 1.1 implies that either (i) $Df(0)$ has an eigenvalue λ that is a primitive M-th root of unity, or (ii) the two eigenvalues of $Df(0)$ are primitive m_1-th and m_2-th roots of unity, respectively, and $M = [m_1, m_2] > \max\{m_1, m_2\}$.

The inequality (1.4) is easy to prove in the first case (i): it can be dealt with as the above one dimensional case by a small perturbation.

In the second case (ii), (1.4) is equivalent to

$$\mu_{f^M}(0) - \mu_{f^{m_1}}(0) - \mu_{f^{m_2}}(0) + 1 > 0. \tag{1.6}$$

In fact, in this case, $m_1 \nmid m_2, m_2 \nmid m_1$, and then the origin is a simple fixed point of f with $\mu_f(0) = P_1(f, 0) = 1$ and by Lemma 2.5, each periodic point of the linear part of f at the origin only has period $1, m_1, m_2$ or $M = [m_1, m_2]$. Therefore, by Shub and Sullivan's work (see Lemmas 2.6 and 2.7 (i)), we have

$$\mu_{f^M}(0) = P_M(f, 0) + P_{m_1}(f, 0) + P_{m_2}(f, 0) + 1,$$

$$\mu_{f^{m_j}}(0) = P_{m_j}(f, 0) + 1, j = 1, 2,$$

and then we have

$$P_M(f, 0) = \mu_{f^M}(0) - \mu_{f^{m_1}}(0) - \mu_{f^{m_2}}(0) + 1,$$

and the equivalence of (1.4) and (1.6) follows.

The inequality (1.6) is obtained by the author in [14], which is the key ingredient in [14] for solving Problem 1.2 for $n = 2$. When $n > 2$, the perturbation method used to prove inequalities such as (1.5) and (1.6), which strongly depends upon one variable complex analysis, no longer works directly.

Fortunately, we can make up this shortage by involving an elementary result of the normal form theory. In Section 2 we shall introduce some results about fixed point indices of iterated holomorphic mappings for later use. Most of them are known. In Section 3, we shall compute Dold's indices for mappings in a special case. Then, in Sections 4 and 5, we shall show that the general case can be reduced to the special case considered in Section 3, by small perturbations and coordinate transformations, and the inequality (1.4) will finally be proved in the general case. The necessity in Theorem 1.1 will be proved by the way.

2. Some properties of fixed point indices of holomorphic mappings

In this section we introduce some results about fixed point indices of iterated holomorphic mappings for later use. Most of them are known.

Let U be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$, the space of holomorphic mappings from $\overline{U}$ into $\mathbb{C}^n$. If f has no fixed point on the boundary ∂U, then the fixed point set $\mathrm{Fix}(f)$ of f is a compact analytic subset of U, and then it is finite (see [4]); and therefore, we can define the global fixed point index $L(f)$ of f as:

$$L(f) = \sum_{p \in \mathrm{Fix}(f)} \mu_f(p),$$

which is just the number of all fixed points of f, counting indices. $L(f)$ is, in fact, the Lefschetz fixed point index of f (see the Appendix section for the details).

For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the m-th iteration f^m of f is understood to be defined on

$$K_m(f) = \cap_{k=0}^{m-1} f^{-k}(\overline{U}) = \{x \in \overline{U}; f^k(x) \in \overline{U} \text{ for all } k = 1, \ldots, m-1\},$$

which is the largest set where f^m is well defined. Since U is bounded, $K_m(f)$ is a compact subset of $\overline{U}$. Here, $f^0 = id$.

Now, let us introduce the global Dold's index. Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that f^M has no fixed point on the boundary ∂U. Then, for each factor m of M, f^m again has no fixed point on ∂U, and then the fixed point set $\mathrm{Fix}(f^m)$ of f^m is a compact subset of U, since $\mathrm{Fix}(f^m)$ is a closed subset of $K_m(f)$ and $K_m(f)$ is a compact subset of $\overline{U}$. Thus, there exists an open subset V_m of U such that $\mathrm{Fix}(f^m) \subset V_m \subset \overline{V_m} \subset U$ and f^m is well defined on $\overline{V_m}$, and thus $L(f^m|_{\overline{V_m}})$ is well defined and we write $L(f^m) = L(f^m|_{\overline{V_m}})$, where $f^m|_{\overline{V_m}}$ is the restriction of f^m to $\overline{V_m}$. In this way, we can define the global Dold's index (see [6]) as (1.2):

$$P_M(f) = \sum_{\tau \subset P(M)} (-1)^{\#\tau} L(f^{M:\tau}). \tag{2.1}$$

It is clear that, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and any compact subset K of U with $\cup_{j=1}^m f^j(K) \subset U$, there exists a neighborhood $V \subset U$ of K, such that for any $g \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ sufficiently close to f (in the sense that $||g - f||_{\overline{U}} = \max_{x \in \overline{U}} |g(x) - f(x)|$ is sufficiently small), the iterations $g^j, j = 1, \ldots, m$, are well defined on $\overline{V}$ and

$$||g - f||_{\overline{U}} \to 0 \Longrightarrow \max_{1 \le j \le m} ||g^j - f^j||_{\overline{V}} \to 0.$$

We shall use these facts frequently and tacitly.

The following result follows from Rouché's theorem for equidimensional holomorphic mappings directly.

Lemma 2.1 ([9]). *Let U be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$, let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ and assume that f has no fixed point on the boundary ∂U. Then:*

(1) f has only finitely many fixed points in U and for any $g \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ that is sufficiently close to f ($||f - g||_{\overline{U}}$ is small enough), g has no fixed point on ∂U, has only finitely many fixed points in U and satisfies

$$L(g) = \sum_{p \in \mathrm{Fix}(g)} \mu_g(p) = \sum_{p \in \mathrm{Fix}(f)} \mu_f(p) = L(f);$$

say, the number of fixed points of g, counting indices, equals to that of f.

(2) In particular, if $p_0 \in U$ is the unique fixed point of f in $\overline{U}$ and if $||f - g||_{\overline{U}}$ is small enough, then

$$L(g) = \sum_{p \in \mathrm{Fix}(g)} \mu_g(p) = \mu_f(p_0) = L(f),$$

and furthermore, if in addition all fixed points of g are simple, then

$$L(g) = \#\mathrm{Fix}(g) = \mu_f(p_0).$$

Corollary 2.1. *Let M be a positive integer, let U be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$, let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ and assume that f^M has no fixed point on ∂U. Then:*

(i). There exists an open subset V of U, such that f^M is well defined on $\overline{V}$, has no fixed point outside V, and has only finitely many fixed points in V.

(ii). For any $g \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ sufficiently close to f, g^M is well defined on $\overline{V}$, has no fixed point outside V and has only finitely many fixed points in V; and furthermore,

$$L(g^M) = L(f^M), \;\; P_M(g) = P_M(f).$$

(iii). In particular, if $p_0 \in U$ is the unique fixed point of both f and f^M in $\overline{U}$, then for any $g \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ sufficiently close to f,

$$L(g^M) = L(f^M) = \mu_{f^M}(p_0), \; P_M(g) = P_M(f) = P_M(f, p_0).$$

Remark 2.1. *Under the assumption that f^M has no fixed point on ∂U, for any factor m of M, the conclusions (i)–(iii) remain valid if M is replaced by m, since f^m has no fixed point on ∂U as well.*

Proof. Recall that the domain of definition of f^M is the set

$$K_M(f) = \cap_{k=0}^{M-1} f^{-k}(\overline{U}) = \{x \in \overline{U};\; f^k(x) \in \overline{U} \text{ for all } k = 1, \ldots, M-1\},$$

which is a compact subset of $\overline{U}$, where $f^0 = id$. Then the fixed point set $\mathrm{Fix}(f^M)$ of f^M equals to $\{x \in K_M(f); f^M(x) = x\}$, which is a compact subset of $K_M(f)$. Therefore, by the assumption that f^M has no fixed point on ∂U, $\mathrm{Fix}(f^M)$ is a compact subset of U, and then there exists an open subset U' of U with $\overline{U'} \subset U$, such that $\mathrm{Fix}(f^M) \subset U'$.

Thus, for the open set $V = \cap_{k=0}^{M-1} f^{-k}(U')$, we conclude that f^M has no fixed point outside V. On the other hand, since $\overline{V} \subset \cap_{k=0}^{M-1} f^{-k}(\overline{U'}) \subset K_M(f)$, f^M is well defined on $\overline{V}$. Therefore, f^M has only finitely many fixed points in V by Lemma 2.1, and hence (i) holds for this open set V; and furthermore, we have

$$f^k(\overline{V}) \subset \overline{U'} \subset U, \text{ for all } k = 1, \ldots, M-1. \tag{2.2}$$

Now, let $g \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$. To prove (ii), we first prove:

(iv). If $||f - g||_{\overline{U}}$ is small enough, then g^M is well defined on $\overline{V}$ and has no fixed point outside V.

Clearly, $\overline{V}$ is compact. Therefore, by (2.2), if $||f - g||_{\overline{U}}$ is small enough, then $g^k(\overline{V}) \subset U$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, M - 1$, and then g^M is well defined on $\overline{V}$.

Thus, if (iv) fails, then there exists a sequence $\{g_j\} \subset \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$, uniformly converging to f, such that for each j, g_j^M is well defined on $\overline{V}$ and g_j^M has a fixed point $p_j \in \overline{U} \backslash V$. Since $\overline{U} \backslash V$ is compact, we may assume that

$$p_j \to p, \text{ as } j \to \infty, \tag{2.3}$$

for some $p \in \overline{U} \backslash V$.

But then, we can prove a contradiction: $f^M(p)$ is well defined and

$$f^M(p) = p, \tag{2.4}$$

which contradicts the proved conclusion that f^M has no fixed point outside V.

What g_j^M has a fixed point p_j means that g_j^M is well defined at p_j, say,

$$g_j^k(p_j) \in \overline{U} \text{ for all } k = 1, \ldots, M, \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$g_j^M(p_j) = p_j. \tag{2.6}$$

We first show that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \leq M$, $f^k(p)$ is well defined and

$$f^k(p) \in \overline{U} \text{ and } |f^k(p) - g_j^k(p_j)| \to 0 \text{ as } j \to \infty. \tag{2.7}$$

We prove this by induction on k. By (2.3), by the continuity of f at p, and by the uniform convergence of g_j (note that $f(p)$ is well defined), we have

$$|f(p) - g_j(p_j)| \leq |f(p) - f(p_j)| + |f(p_j) - g_j(p_j)| \to 0, \text{ as } j \to \infty.$$

Then by (2.5) we have $f(p) \in \overline{U}$. Therefore, the conclusion is true for $k = 1$.

Let t be any positive integer with $t < M$ and assume that the conclusion is valid for $k = t$. Then $f^t(p) \in \overline{U}$, and then by (2.5), both $f^{t+1}(p)$ and $f(g_j^t(p_j))$ are well defined. Therefore, again by the induction hypothesis, by the continuity of f at $f^t(p)$ and by the uniform convergence of g_j we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f^{t+1}(p) - g_j^{t+1}(p_j)| &\leq |f(f^t(p)) - f(g_j^t(p_j))| + |f(g_j^t(p_j)) - g_j(g_j^t(p_j))| \\ &\to 0 \text{ as } j \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $f^{t+1}(p) \in \overline{U}$ by (2.5). Therefore, the conclusion is true for $k = t + 1$. This completes the induction.

By (2.7), $f^M(p)$ is well defined and $|f^M(p) - g_j^M(p_j)|$ tends to 0 as j tends to ∞, and then (2.4) holds by (2.3) and (2.6). This completes the proof of (iv).

By (iv) and Lemma 2.1, if $||f - g||_{\overline{U}}$ is small enough, then the set of all fixed points of g^M is contained in V and is finite.

It is clear that (iv) remains valid if M is replaced by any factor m of M. On the other hand, if $||f - g||_{\overline{U}}$ is small enough, then $||g^m - f^m||_{\overline{V}}$ is also small enough for all factors m of M. Therefore, if $||f - g||_{\overline{U}}$ is small enough, then by (i), (iv) and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$L(f^m) = L(f^m|_{\overline{V}}) = L(g^m|_{\overline{V}}) = L(g^m), \text{ for all factors } m \text{ of } M,$$

and then $P_M(f) = P_M(g)$ by the formula (2.1), and (ii) is proved.

By the hypothesis in (iii) and the definitions, we have $\mu_{f^M}(p_0) = L(f^M)$ and $P_M(f, p_0) = P_M(f)$, and then (iii) follows from (ii) directly. ☐

Lemma 2.2 ([9])**.** *Let U be an open subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$, let $f \in \mathcal{O}(U, \mathbb{C}^n)$ and assume that $p \in U$ is an isolated fixed point of f. Then $\mu_f(p) \geq 1$, and equality holds if and only if p is a simple fixed point of f, say, $Df(p)$ has no eigenvalue 1.*

Corollary 2.2. *Let U be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$, let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ and assume that f^M has no fixed point on ∂U. If f has a periodic point $p \in U$ with period M, then any $g \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ that is sufficiently close to f has a periodic point with period M in U.*

Proof. By the assumption, p, $f(p), \ldots, f^{M-1}(p)$ are distinct each other and all located in U, and moreover, by Corollary 2.1 (i), p is an isolated fixed point of f^M. Therefore, there exists a ball B in U centered at p such that p is the unique fixed point of f^M in $\overline{B}$ and, for any $g \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ such that $||g - f||_{\overline{U}}$ is small enough, g^M is well defined on $\overline{B}$ and has no fixed point on ∂B, and

$$\overline{B} \cap g^k(\overline{B}) = \emptyset, 1 \leq k \leq M - 1. \tag{2.8}$$

Therefore, by Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, if $||g - f||_{\overline{U}}$ is small enough, then

$$\sum_{q \in \mathrm{Fix}(g^M|_{\overline{B}})} \mu_{g^M}(q) = L(g^M|_{\overline{B}}) = L(f^M|_{\overline{B}}) = \mu_{f^M}(p) \geq 1,$$

and then g^M has a fixed point q in B, and by (2.8), q is a periodic point of g with period M. ☐

A fixed point p of f is called *hyperbolic* if $Df(p)$ has no eigenvalue of absolute 1. If p is a hyperbolic fixed point of f, then it is a hyperbolic fixed point of all iterations $f^j, j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let M be a positive integer, let U be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$. Assume that V is an open subset of U such that f^M is well defined on $\overline{V}$ and has no fixed point on ∂V. Then there exists a sequence $\{f_j\} \subset \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$, uniformly converging to f, such that for each j, f_j^M is well defined on $\overline{V}$ and all the fixed points of f_j^M located in $\overline{V}$ are hyperbolic.*

A proof of this result follows from the argument in [2]. Another proof can be found in [15].

Corollary 2.3. *Let M be a positive integer, let U be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$, let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ and assume that f^M has no fixed point on ∂U. Then there exists a sequence $\{f_j\} \subset \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$, uniformly converging to f, such that f_j^M has only finitely many fixed points, all of which are hyperbolic, for each j.*

Proof. By the hypothesis, Corollary 2.1 applies. Thus, the conclusion follows from applying Lemma 2.3 to $f : \overline{U} \to \mathbb{C}^n$ and the set V given by Corollary 2.1. ☐

Lemma 2.4. *Let M be a positive integer, let U be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{C}^n$ and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{U}, \mathbb{C}^n)$. Assume that f^M has no fixed point on ∂U and each fixed point of f^M is simple. Then $\mathrm{Fix}(f^M)$ is finite, and*

(i). $L(f^M) = \#\mathrm{Fix}(f^M) = \sum_{m|M} P_m(f)$.

(ii). $P_M(f)$ is the cardinality of the set of periodic points of f with period M.

Proof. This was proved in [7]. In fact, each fixed point of f^m with $m|M$ is also simple, and then it has index 1. On the other hand, by Corollary 2.1 (i), for each factor m of M, $\mathrm{Fix}(f^m)$ is finite, and then $L(f^m)$ is equal to the cardinality of $\mathrm{Fix}(f^m)$. Therefore, (i) and (ii) follows from the argument in Section 1.1 (see also [6], p. 421–422). $\square$

Corollary 2.4. *Let M be a positive integer and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{\Delta^n}, \mathbb{C}^n)$. Assume that the origin is an isolated fixed point of both f and f^M. Then $P_M(f, 0) \geq 0$, and furthermore, the following three conditions are equivalent.*

(a). $P_M(f, 0) > 0$.

(b). There exist a ball $B \subset \Delta^n$ centered at the origin and a sequence $\{f_j\} \subset \mathcal{O}(\overline{B}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ uniformly converging to f on $\overline{B}$, such that for each f_j,

$$f_j(0) = 0 \text{ and } P_M(f_j, 0) > 0. \tag{2.9}$$

(c). There exist a ball $B \subset \Delta^n$ centered at the origin and a sequence $\{f_j\} \subset \mathcal{O}(\overline{B}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ uniformly converging to f on $\overline{B}$, such that each f_j has a periodic point of period M converging to the origin.

By the following proof, the ball B in (b) and (c) can be replaced with Δ^n.

Proof. By the hypothesis, there exists a ball $B_1 \subset \Delta^n$ centered at the origin such that f^M is well defined on $\overline{B_1}$ and

$$\overline{B_1} \cap \mathrm{Fix}(f) = \overline{B_1} \cap \mathrm{Fix}(f^M) = \{0\}. \tag{2.10}$$

Then by the definition we have

$$P_M(f, 0) = P_M(f|_{\overline{B_1}}), \tag{2.11}$$

and, by Corollary 2.1 and Lemma 2.3, there exists a $g \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{\Delta^n}, \mathbb{C}^n)$, which can be chosen arbitrarily close to f, such that g^M is well defined on $\overline{B_1}$, all fixed points of g^M located in $\overline{B_1}$ are hyperbolic and

$$\partial B_1 \cap \mathrm{Fix}(g^M) = \emptyset \text{ and } P_M(g|_{\overline{B_1}}) = P_M(f|_{\overline{B_1}}). \tag{2.12}$$

By Lemma 2.4, we have $P_M(g|_{\overline{B_1}}) \geq 0$, and then we have $P_M(f, 0) \geq 0$. It remains to prove the equivalences.

If $P_M(f, 0) > 0$, then we have by (2.11) and (2.12) that $P_M(g|_{\overline{B_1}}) > 0$, and then again by Lemma 2.4, g has a periodic point x_g of period M in B_1, which converges to the origin as g uniformly converges to f, by (2.10). Thus, (a) implies (c).

If there exist a ball $B \subset \Delta^n$ and a sequence $\{f_j\} \subset \mathcal{O}(\overline{B}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ satisfying (b) or (c), then we may assume $B = B_1$, by shrinking B or B_1. Then by (2.10), (2.11) and Corollary 2.1, for a sufficiently large $j = j_0$, we have

$$\partial B_1 \cap \mathrm{Fix}(f_{j_0}^M) = \emptyset \text{ and } P_M(f, 0) = P_M(f|_{\overline{B_1}}) = P_M(f_{j_0}), \tag{2.13}$$

and then by Corollaries 2.1 and 2.3, there exists an $h \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{B_1}, \mathbb{C}^n)$, which can be chosen arbitrarily close to f_{j_0}, such that

$$\partial B_1 \cap \mathrm{Fix}(h^M) = \emptyset \text{ and } P_M(h) = P_M(f_{j_0}), \tag{2.14}$$

and that all fixed points of h^M are hyperbolic.

If (c) holds, then by Corollary 2.2, h may be taken so close to f_{j_0} that h has a periodic point of period M, and then by Lemma 2.4, $P_M(h) > 0$. Therefore, by (2.13) and (2.14), we have $P_M(f, 0) > 0$, and hence, (c) implies (a).

By the first part of (2.13) and Corollary 2.1, there exists a ball $B_2 \subset B_1$ centered at the origin such that $f_{j_0}^M$ has no fixed point in $\overline{B_2}$ other than the origin. Therefore, if (b) holds, then again by Corollary 2.1, we may take h so close to f_{j_0} that

$$P_M(h|_{\overline{B_2}}) = P_M(f_{j_0}|_{\overline{B_2}}) = P_M(f_{j_0}, 0) > 0,$$

and all the above properties of h remain. But then h has a periodic point in B_2 of period M, by Lemma 2.4. Since all fixed points of h^M are hyperbolic, again by Lemma 2.4, we have $P_M(h) > 0$, and then by (2.13) and (2.14) we have $P_M(f, 0) > 0$, and then (b) implies (a).

It is trivial that (a) implies (b). This completes the proof. □

Lemma 2.5. *Let $L : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a linear mapping and let $M > 1$ be a positive integer. Then L has a periodic point of period M if and only if there exist positive integers $m_1, \ldots, m_s$ $(s \le n)$ such that $M = [m_1, \ldots, m_s]$ and that L has eigenvalues that are primitive m_1-th, ..., m_s-th roots of unity, respectively.*

This is a basic knowledge of elementary linear algebra. Recall that $[m_1, \ldots, m_s]$ denotes the least common multiple of $m_1, \ldots, m_s$. The following result is due to M. Shub and D. Sullivan [11]. It is also proved in [15].

Lemma 2.6. *Let $m > 1$ be a positive integer and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\Delta^n, \mathbb{C}^n)$. Assume that the origin is an isolated fixed point of f and that, for each eigenvalue λ of $Df(0)$, either $\lambda = 1$ or $\lambda^m \ne 1$. Then the origin is still an isolated fixed point of f^m and*

$$\mu_f(0) = \mu_{f^m}(0).$$

Corollary 2.5. *Let $m > 1$ be a positive integer and let $f \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{\Delta^n}, \mathbb{C}^n)$. Assume that the origin is an isolated fixed point of both f and f^m, and that the linear part of f at the origin has no periodic point of period m. Then there exists a ball B centered at the origin, such that for any $g \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{\Delta^n}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ that is sufficiently close to f on $\overline{B}$, g has no periodic point of period m in B.*

Proof. This was proved in [3] and [14] for C^1 mappings. Here we give a much simpler proof. If the linear part of f at the origin has no periodic point of period m, then by Lemma 2.5, for the least common multiple m^* of all numbers of the set

$$\{m' \in \mathbb{N}; m'|m \text{ and } Df(0) \text{ has an eigenvalue that is a primitive } m'\text{-th root of } 1\},$$

we have $m^*|m$ and $m^* < m$ (if the above set is empty, then write $m^* = 1$), and each eigenvalue λ of $Df(0)$ with $\lambda^m = 1$ satisfies $\lambda^{m^*} = 1$. Then for $d = m/m^*$ and for any eigenvalue η of $Df^{m^*}(0)$, either $\eta = 1$ or $\eta^d \ne 1$, which implies that for each factor d_1 of d, either $\eta = 1$ or $\eta^{d_1} \ne 1$. Therefore, by the above lemma, $\mu_{f^{m^*}}(0) = \mu_{(f^{m^*})^{d_1}}(0)$ for any factor d_1 of d, and then

$$P_d(f^{m^*}, 0) = \sum_{\tau \subset P(d)} (-1)^{\#\tau} \mu_{(f^{m^*})^{d:\tau}}(0) = \mu_{f^{m^*}}(0) \sum_{\tau \subset P(d)} (-1)^{\#\tau} = 0.$$

If the conclusion of the corollary fails, then there exists a sequence $\{f_j\} \subset \mathcal{O}(\overline{\Delta^n}, \mathbb{C}^n)$, uniformly converging to f in a neighborhood of the origin, such that f_j has a periodic point x_j with period m converging to the origin, and then $f_j^{m^*}$ uniformly converges to f^{m^*} in a neighborhood of the origin and x_j is a periodic point of $f_j^{m^*}$ with period d converging to the origin, and then by Corollary 2.4 we have $P_d(f^{m^*}, 0) > 0$. This is a contradiction, and the proof is complete. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let* $f \in \mathcal{O}(\overline{\Delta^n}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ *with* $f(0) = 0$, *and let*

$$\mathfrak{M}_f = \{m \in \mathbb{N};\ \text{the linear part of } f \text{ at } 0 \text{ has a periodic point of period } m\}.$$

Then:

(i). For each $m \in \mathbb{N}\backslash\mathfrak{M}_f$ *such that the origin is an isolated fixed point of* f^m,

$$P_m(f, 0) = 0.$$

(ii). For each positive integer M *such that the origin is an isolated fixed point of* f^M,

$$\mu_{f^M}(0) = \sum_{m \in \mathfrak{M}_f,\ m|M} P_m(f, 0). \tag{2.15}$$

Proof. This was essentially proved in [3] in a more complicated setting for C^1 mappings. Here we give a much simpler proof.

(i) follows from Corollaries 2.4 and 2.5 directly. To prove (ii), let M be a positive integer such that the origin is an isolated fixed point of f^M. Since all quantities in (2.15) are completely determined by the local behavior of f near the origin, by shrinking Δ^n, we may assume that the origin is the unique fixed point of both f and f^M. Then, the origin is the unique fixed point of f^m for each factor m of M, and then by Corollaries 2.1 (iii) and 2.3, there exists a holomorphic mapping $g : \overline{\Delta^n} \to \mathbb{C}^n$ sufficiently close to f, such that g^M has no fixed point on $\partial\Delta^n$, all fixed points of g^M are hyperbolic and

$$\mu_{f^M}(0) = L(g^M),\ P_m(f, 0) = P_m(g) \text{ for each } m|M. \tag{2.16}$$

Now, Lemma 2.4 applies to g, and we have

$$L(g^M) = \sum_{m|M} P_m(g).$$

Therefore, by (2.16) and (i) we have

$$\mu_{f^M}(0) = \sum_{m|M} P_m(g) = \sum_{m|M} P_m(f, 0) = \sum_{m \in \mathfrak{M}_f,\ m|M} P_m(f, 0).$$

This completes the proof. □

It is well known that the fixed point index is invariant after any biholomorphic transformation of coordinate, and therefore, so is the Dold's index, by the definition. Thus we have:

Lemma 2.8. *Let* $f, h \in \mathcal{O}(\Delta^n, \mathbb{C}^n)$ *and let* k *be a positive integer such that the origin is an isolated fixed point of both* f *and* f^k. *Assume* $h(0) = 0$ *and* $\det Dh(0) \neq 0$ *and write* $g = h \circ f \circ h^{-1}$. *Then the origin is still an isolated fixed point of both* g *and* g^k, $\mu_{f^k}(0) = \mu_{g^k}(0)$ *and* $P_k(f, 0) = P_k(g, 0)$.

3. **Computations of Dold's indices under Conditions** 3.1–3.5

In this section, we shall apply Cronin's theorem to compute Dold's indices (at the origin) of the holomorphic mapping $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n) : \Delta^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ given by

$$\begin{cases} f_j(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = & \lambda_j x_j + x_j \sum_{i=1}^{s} a_{ji} x_i^{m_i} + o_j,\ j = 1, \ldots, s, \\ f_r(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = & \mu_r x_r + R_r,\ r = s+1, \ldots, n, \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

associated with the following five conditions.

Condition 3.1. *$\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ are primitive m_1-th, $\dots, m_s$-th roots of unity, respectively, and $m_1, \dots, m_s$ are mutually distinct primes. Thus, $m_1 \geq 2, \dots, m_s \geq 2$.*

Condition 3.2. *$\mu_r^{m_1 \dots m_s} \neq 1$ for each $r = s+1, \dots, n$.*

Condition 3.3. *Each principal submatrix[1] of $A = (a_{ji})$ is invertible.*

Condition 3.4. *Each o_j is a power series of the form*

$$o_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_j h_j(x_1^{m_1}, \dots, x_s^{m_s}) + o_j'(x_1, \dots, x_n),$$

such that $h_j(x_1^{m_1}, \dots, x_s^{m_s})$ is a polynomial in $x_1^{m_1}, \dots, x_s^{m_s}$ of the form

$$h_j(x_1^{m_1}, \dots, x_s^{m_s}) = \sum_{i_1+i_2+\dots+i_s=2}^{N_j} c^j_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_s} (x_1^{m_1})^{i_1} (x_2^{m_2})^{i_2} \dots (x_s^{m_s})^{i_s}, \tag{3.2}$$

in which N_j is a positive integer and all $c^j_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_s}$ are constants, and that $o_j'(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a power series in $x_1, \dots, x_n$, consisting of terms of degree larger than $(m_1 \dots m_s)^2$.

Condition 3.5. *Each R_r is a power series in $x_1, \dots, x_n$ consisting of terms of degree ≥ 2.*

Here, and throughout this paper, all power series are convergent in a neighborhood of the origin. The goal of this section is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *For any t-tuple $(i_1, \dots, i_t)$ of positive integers with $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_t \leq s$, the origin is an isolated fixed point of $f^{m_{i_1} \dots m_{i_t}}$,*

$$\mu_{f^{m_{i_1} \dots m_{i_t}}}(0) = (m_{i_1} + 1) \dots (m_{i_t} + 1), \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$P_{m_{i_1} \dots m_{i_t}}(f, 0) = m_{i_1} \dots m_{i_t}. \tag{3.4}$$

To prove this result, we first introduce two known results and prove Lemma 3.2.

Lemma 3.1 ([9])**.** *Let $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{O}(\Delta^n, \mathbb{C}^n)$. If the origin is an isolated zero of both h_1 and h_2, then the zero order of $h_1 \circ h_2$ at the origin equals to the product of the zero orders of h_1 and h_2 at the origin, say, $\pi_{h_1 \circ h_2}(0) = \pi_{h_1}(0)\pi_{h_2}(0)$.*

Theorem 3.1 (**Cronin** [5])**.** *Let $m_1, \dots, m_n$ be positive integers and let $P = (P_1, \dots, P_n) : \Delta^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a holomorphic mapping given by*

$$P_j(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \sum_{k=m_j}^{\infty} P_{jk}(z_1, \cdots, z_n), \ j = 1, \cdots, n,$$

where each P_{jk} is a homogeneous polynomial of degree k in $z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n$. If $0 = (0, \dots, 0)$ is an isolated solution of the system of n equations

$$P_{jm_j}(z_1, \dots, z_n) = 0, \ j = 1, \dots, n,$$

then the origin is an isolated zero of the mapping P with order

$$\pi_P(0) = m_1 m_2 \dots m_n.$$

---

[1] For the $n \times n$ matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, a $k \times k$ submatrix $B = (b_{st}) = (a_{i_s j_t})$ of A is called a principal submatrix of A if it is obtained from A by deleting some $n - k$ rows and deleting the columns in the same order, say, $i_1 = j_1, \dots, i_k = j_k$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let k be a positive integer. Then the k-th iteration $f^k = (f_1^{(k)}, \ldots, f_n^{(k)})$ of f also has the form (3.1), together with Conditions 3.3—3.5, say precisely, the components of f^k is given by*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} f_j^{(k)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = & \lambda_j^k x_j + k\lambda_j^{k-1} x_j \sum_{i=1}^s a_{ji} x_i^{m_i} + o_j^{(k)},\ 1 \le j \le s, \\ f_r^{(k)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = & \mu_r^k x_r + R_r^{(k)},\ s+1 \le r \le n, \end{array} \right. \tag{3.5}$$

where $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s, \mu_{s+1}, \ldots, \mu_n, a_{ji}$ are the numbers in (3.1), each $o_j^{(k)}$ satisfies Condition 3.4 and each $R_r^{(k)}$ satisfies Condition 3.5.

Proof. The conclusion is obvious for $r = s+1, \ldots, n$. By the assumption on the mapping $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$, for each $j = 1, \ldots, s$, we can write

$$f_j(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = x_j \left[\lambda_j + \sum_{i=1}^s a_{ji} x_i^{m_i} + h_j(x_1^{m_1}, \ldots, x_s^{m_s}) \right] + o_j'(x_1, \ldots, x_n),$$

where h_j and o_j' are given in Condition 3.4. It is clear that the terms in the power series $f_j^{(k)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ affected by $o_i'(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, $i = 1, \ldots, s$, in the iteration process are all of degree $> (m_1 \ldots m_s)^2$. Therefore, we may assume that the terms $o_i', i = 1, \ldots, s$, are all zero. Then, we can complete the proof by showing that

$$f_j^{(k)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = x_j \left[\lambda_j^k + k\lambda_j^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^s a_{ji} x_i^{m_i} + h_j^{(k)}(x_1^{m_1}, \ldots, x_s^{m_s}) \right], \tag{3.6}$$

for each $j = 1, \ldots, s$, where $h_j^{(k)}(x_1^{m_1}, \ldots, x_s^{m_s})$ is a polynomial, in $x_1^{m_1}, \ldots, x_s^{m_s}$, that has the form of (3.2). The proof is by induction on k.

For $k = 1$, the conclusion is trivial. Assume that (3.6) holds for $k = l$ and $h_j^{(l)}$ is in the form of (3.2). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} f_j^{(l+1)} &= f_j^{(l)} \circ f = f_j^{(l)}(f_1, \ldots, f_n) \\ &= [f_j] \left[\lambda_j^l + l\lambda_j^{l-1} \sum_{i=1}^s a_{ji} f_i^{m_i} + h_j^{(l)}((f_1)^{m_1}, \ldots, (f_s)^{m_s}) \right], \end{aligned}$$

For each $i = 1, \ldots, s$, considering that $\lambda_i^{m_i} = 1$, we have that

$$(f_i(x_1, \ldots, x_n))^{m_i} = x_i^{m_i} + p_i(x_1^{m_1}, \ldots, x_s^{m_s}),$$

where $p_i(x_1^{m_1}, \ldots, x_s^{m_s})$ is a power series in $x_1^{m_1}, \ldots, x_s^{m_s}$ having the form of (3.2) (note that we assumed $o_i' \equiv 0$). Thus, it is obvious that there exist polynomials $q_j^{(l+1)}$ and $h_j^{(l+1)}$, in $x_1^{m_1}, \ldots, x_s^{m_s}$, having the form of (3.2), such that

$$\begin{aligned} f_j^{(l+1)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) &= \left[x_j \left(\lambda_j + \sum_{i=1}^s a_{ji} x_i^{m_i} + h_j(x_1^{m_1}, \ldots, x_s^{m_s}) \right) \right] \\ &\quad \left[\lambda_j^l + l\lambda_j^{l-1} \sum_{i=1}^s a_{ji} x_i^{m_i} + q_j^{(l+1)}(x_1^{m_1}, \ldots, x_s^{m_s}) \right] \\ &= x_j \left[\lambda_j^{l+1} + (l+1)\,\lambda_j^l \sum_{i=1}^s a_{ji} x_i^{m_i} + h_j^{(l+1)}(x_1^{m_1}, \ldots, x_s^{m_s}) \right], \end{aligned}$$

This completes the induction. □

Proof of Proposition 3.1. For each $t = 1, \dots, s$, we first prove (3.3) for the t-tuple $(i_1, \dots, i_t) = (1, 2, \dots, t)$.

By Lemma 3.2, putting $M = m_1 \dots m_t$ and $f^M = (f_1^{(M)}, \dots, f_n^{(M)})$, we have, for $j = 1, \dots, s$ and $r = s+1, \dots, n$,

$$\begin{cases} f_j^{(M)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \lambda_j^M x_j + M\lambda_j^{M-1} x_j \sum_{i=1}^s a_{ji} x_i^{m_i} + o_j^{(M)}, \\ f_r^{(M)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \mu_r^M x_r + R_r^{(M)}, \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

where, each $o_j^{(M)} = o_j^{(M)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ satisfies Condition 3.4 and each $R_r^{(M)} = R_r^{(M)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ satisfies Condition 3.5.

By Condition 3.1, we have $\lambda_j^M = 1$ for $j = 1, \dots, t$, and $\lambda_j^M \neq 1$ for $j = t+1, \dots, s$. Then by (3.7), putting $f_i^{(M)} = f_i^{(M)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{cases} f_j^{(M)} - x_j = c_j x_j \sum_{i=1}^s a_{ji} x_i^{m_i} + o_j^{(M)}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq t, \\ f_j^{(M)} - x_j = x_j(d_j + \text{higher terms}) + o_j^{(M)}, \quad t+1 \leq j \leq s, \\ f_r^{(M)} - x_r = e_r x_r + R_r^{(M)}, \quad s+1 \leq r \leq n, \end{cases} \tag{3.8}$$

where $c_j = M\lambda_j^{M-1} \neq 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, t$, $d_j = \lambda_j^M - 1 \neq 0$ for $j = t+1, \dots, s$, and $e_r = \mu_r^M - 1 \neq 0$ for $r = s+1, \dots, n$ (by Condition 3.2).

Let $H : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be the mapping

$$(x_1, \dots, x_n) = H(z_1, \dots, z_n) = (z_1^{\frac{M}{m_1}}, \dots, z_t^{\frac{M}{m_t}}, z_{t+1}^M, \dots, z_s^M, z_{s+1}, \dots, z_n).$$

Since for each $j \leq s, o_j^{(M)}$ satisfies Condition 3.4, each term of the power series $o_j^{(M)} = o_j^{(M)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is either a monomial of the form

$$C_1 x_j x_1^{m_1 i_1} \dots x_t^{m_t i_t} x_{t+1}^{m_{t+1} i_{t+1}} \dots x_s^{m_s i_s} \text{ with } i_1 + \dots + i_s \geq 2,$$

or a monomial of the form

$$C_2 x_1^{k_1} x_2^{k_2} \dots x_n^{k_n} \text{ with } k_1 + k_2 + \dots + k_n > (m_1 \dots m_s)^2,$$

where C_1 and C_2 are constants; and therefore, each term of the power series $o_j^{(M)} \circ H(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ is either a monomial of the form

$$C_1 z_j^{\alpha_j} z_1^{Mi_1} \dots z_t^{Mi_t} z_{t+1}^{Mm_{t+1}i_{t+1}} \dots z_s^{Mm_s i_s}$$

($\alpha_j = \frac{M}{m_j} \in \mathbb{N}$ if $1 \leq j \leq t$, or $\alpha_j = M$ if $t+1 \leq j \leq s$) with degree $> 2M$, or a monomial of the form

$$C_2 z_1^{\frac{M}{m_1}k_1} \dots z_t^{\frac{M}{m_t}k_t} z_{t+1}^{Mk_{t+1}} \dots z_s^{Mk_s} z_{s+1}^{k_{s+1}} \dots z_n^{k_n}$$

with degree $> (m_1 \dots m_s)^2 \geq (m_1 \dots m_t)^2 \geq 2M$ (note that all $m_j \geq 2$), and then, $o_j^{(M)} \circ H(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ is a power series in $z_1, \dots, z_n$ such that each term has degree $> 2M$.

On the other hand, it is obvious that $R_r^{(M)} \circ H(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ is a power series in $z_1, \dots, z_n$ consisting of terms of degree ≥ 2, for each $r = s+1, \dots, n$, by Condition 3.5; and for each $j = 1, \dots, t$, it is also obvious that, after applying the transformation H, $\sum_{i=1}^s a_{ji} x_i^{m_i}$ is changed into

$$\sum_{i=1}^t a_{ji} z_i^M + \sum_{i=t+1}^s a_{ji} z_i^{m_i M} = \sum_{i=1}^t a_{ji} z_i^M + \text{higher terms}.$$

Therefore, putting

$$G_M = (g_1, \dots, g_n) = (id - f^M) \circ H = H - f^M \circ H, \tag{3.9}$$

by (3.8) we have

$$\begin{cases} g_j(z_1, \dots, z_n) = -c_j z_j^{\frac{M}{m_j}} \sum_{i=1}^{t} a_{ji} z_i^M + \text{higher terms}, \ 1 \le j \le t, \\ g_j(z_1, \dots, z_n) = -d_j z_j^M + \text{higher terms}, \ t+1 \le j \le s, \\ g_r(z_1, \dots, z_n) = -e_r z_r + \text{higher terms}, \ s+1 \le r \le n. \end{cases} \tag{3.10}$$

By Condition 3.3, the $t \times t$ principal submatrix $(a_{ji})_{1 \le j,i \le t}$ of the $s \times s$ matrix (a_{ji}) is invertible. Thus, $0 = (0, \dots, 0)$ is an isolated solution of the system of simultaneous equations:

$$\begin{cases} -c_j z_j^{\frac{M}{m_j}} \sum_{i=1}^{t} a_{ji} z_i^M & = 0, \quad 1 \le j \le t, \\ -d_j z_j^M & = 0, \quad t+1 \le j \le s, \\ -e_r z_r & = 0, \quad s+1 \le r \le n. \end{cases}$$

Thus, by Cronin's Theorem and (3.10), the origin is an isolated zero of G_M with order

$$\pi_{G_M}(0) = M^{s-t} \prod_{j=1}^{t} \left(\frac{M}{m_j} + M \right) = \frac{M^s}{m_1 \dots m_t} \prod_{j=1}^{t} (1 + m_j) = M^{s-1} \prod_{j=1}^{t} (1 + m_j),$$

and then the origin is an isolated fixed point f^M. On the other hand, the zero order of H at the origin is $\pi_H(0) = \frac{M^s}{m_1 \dots m_t} = M^{s-1}$. Thus by Lemma 3.1 and (3.9), we have

$$\mu_{f^{m_1 \cdots m_t}}(0) = \mu_{f^M}(0) = \pi_{id - f^M}(0) = \pi_{G_M}(0)/\pi_H(0) = \prod_{j=1}^{t} (1 + m_j).$$

This implies (3.3) for the t-tuple $(i_1, \dots, i_t) = (1, \dots, t)$.

Now, let t be any positive integer with $t \le s$. We show that (3.3) holds for any t-tuple $(i_1, \dots, i_t)$ of positive integers with $1 \le i_1 < \cdots < i_t \le s$. Let

$$(w_1, \dots, w_n) = h(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)})$$

be a transformation given by a permutation σ of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ with

$$\sigma(j) = i_j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, t, \text{ and } \sigma(j) = j \text{ for } j = s+1, \dots, n.$$

Then in the new coordinate $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$, the original mapping $f = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ is changed into $\widetilde{f} = (\widetilde{f}_1, \dots, \widetilde{f}_n) = h \circ f \circ h^{-1}$ with

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{f}_j(w_1, \dots, w_n) = \lambda_{\sigma(j)} w_j + w_j \sum_{i=1}^{s} a_{\sigma(j)\sigma(i)} w_i^{m_{\sigma(i)}} + \widetilde{o}_j, \ j = 1, \dots, s, \\ \widetilde{f}_r(w_1, \dots, w_n) = \mu_r w_r + \widetilde{R}_r, \ s+1 \le r \le s, \end{cases}$$

where $\widetilde{o}_j = \widetilde{o}_j(w_1, \dots, w_n) = o_{\sigma(j)}(w_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, w_{\sigma^{-1}(n)})$ and $\widetilde{R}_r = \widetilde{R}_r(w_1, \dots, w_n) = R_r(w_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, w_{\sigma^{-1}(n)})$. This is also in the form of (3.1) and all the corresponding Conditions 3.1–3.5 are satisfied, but with a modification that $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s, m_1, \dots, m_s, a_{ji}, (x_1, \dots, x_s, x_{s+1}, \dots x_n)$ are just replaced with $\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \lambda_{\sigma(s)}, m_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, m_{\sigma(s)}, a_{\sigma(j)\sigma(i)}, (w_1, \dots, w_s, w_{s+1}, \dots, w_n)$, respectively. Then the above process for the special t-tuple $(1, \dots, t)$ applies to $\widetilde{f}$, and then we have

$$\mu_{\widetilde{f}^{m_{i_1} \cdots m_{i_t}}}(0) = \mu_{\widetilde{f}^{m_{\sigma(1)} \cdots m_{\sigma(t)}}}(0) = \prod_{j=1}^{t} (m_{\sigma(j)} + 1) = \prod_{j=1}^{t} (m_{i_j} + 1).$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2.8 we have $\mu_{f^{m_{i_1}\cdots m_{i_t}}}(0) = \mu_{\widetilde{f}^{m_{i_1}\cdots m_{i_t}}}(0) = \prod_{j=1}^{t}(m_{i_j}+1)$. This completes the proof of (3.3).

To prove (3.4), let

$$\mathfrak{M}_f = \{m \in \mathbb{N};\ \text{the linear part of } f \text{ at } 0 \text{ has a periodic point of period } m\}.$$

Then by Conditions 3.1, 3.2, and Lemma 2.5, $\mathfrak{M}_f$ is the set consisting of 1 and all possible products of mutually distinct numbers taken from the distinct primes $m_1, \ldots, m_s$, and then by (3.3) and Lemma 2.7, for any t-tuple $(i_1, \ldots, i_t)$ of positive integers with $1 \le i_1 < \cdots < i_t \le s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{j=1}^{t}(1+m_{i_j}) &= \mu_{f^{m_{i_1}\cdots m_{i_t}}}(0) = \sum_{m\in\mathfrak{M}_f, m|m_{i_1}\ldots m_{i_t}} P_m(f,0) \\ &= P_1(f,0) + \sum_{k=1}^{t} \sum_{1\le j_1<\cdots<j_k\le t} P_{m_{i_{j_1}}\ldots m_{i_{j_k}}}(f,0), \end{aligned}$$

where the last sum extends over all k-tuples $(j_1, \ldots, j_k)$ of positive integers with $1 \le j_1 < \cdots < j_k \le t$. On the other hand, by the assumption on f, the origin is a simple fixed point of f and so $P_1(f,0) = \mu_f(0) = 1$. Therefore, expanding $\prod_{j=1}^{t}(1+m_{i_j})$ and rewriting the above equation, we have

$$P_{m_{i_1}\ldots m_{i_t}}(f,0) = m_{i_1}\ldots m_{i_t} + \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} \sum_{1\le j_1<\cdots<j_k\le t} (m_{i_{j_1}}\ldots m_{i_{j_k}} - P_{m_{i_{j_1}}\ldots m_{i_{j_k}}}(f,0)).$$

By the above equation, after a standard process of induction on $t \le s$, we have $P_{m_{i_1}\ldots m_{i_t}}(f,0) = m_{i_1}\ldots m_{i_t}$. This completes the proof. □

4. **Normal forms and perturbations**

In this section we shall combine the normal form method and the perturbation method to improve Proposition 3.1, say, to prove the following Proposition, in which Condition 3.1 is weakened to be (B) and Conditions 3.2—3.5 are removed.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $f : \Delta^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a holomorphic mapping. Assume:*

(A). $Df(0)$ is a diagonal matrix.

(B). $Df(0)$ has eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s$ that are primitive m_1-th, $\ldots, m_s$-th roots of unity, respectively, and $m_1, \ldots, m_s$ are positive integers.

(C). The origin is an isolated fixed point of both f and f^M, where $M = [m_1, \cdots, m_s]$ is the least common multiple of $m_1, \ldots, m_s$.

Then $P_M(f,0) > 0$.

The idea to prove this proposition is to reduce the problem into the easier one considered in Section 3, by small perturbations and coordinate transformations. We shall perform this in two steps. The first step is to use the normal form method, Proposition 3.1 and some results in Section 2 to prove Lemma 4.3, which is a weaker version of Proposition 4.1. The second step is to use Lemmas 4.3–4.7 and some results in Section 2 to complete the proof of Proposition 4.1.

The following result is well known in the theory of normal forms (see [1], p. 84–85).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $f : \Delta^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a holomorphic mapping such that $f(0) = 0$ and $Df(0) = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ is a diagonal matrix. Then for any positive integer r, there exists a biholomorphic coordinate transformation in the form of*

$$(y_1, \dots, y_n) = H(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_1, \dots, x_n) + \text{higher terms}$$

in a neighborhood of the origin such that each component g_j of $g = (g_1, \dots, g_n) = H^{-1} \circ f \circ H$ has a power series expansion

$$g_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \lambda_j x_j + \sum_{i_1+\cdots+i_n=2}^{r} c^j_{i_1 \dots i_n} x_1^{i_1} \dots x_n^{i_n} + \text{higher terms}, j = 1, \dots, n,$$

in a neighborhood of the origin, where the sum extends over all n-tuples $(i_1, \dots, i_n)$ of nonnegative integers with

$$2 \le i_1 + \cdots + i_n \le r \text{ and } \lambda_j = \lambda_1^{i_1} \dots \lambda_n^{i_n}.$$

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ satisfy Condition 3.1 and that $(i_1, \dots, i_s)$ is an s-tuple of nonnegative integers. Then for each $j \le s$,*

$$\lambda_j = \lambda_1^{i_1} \dots \lambda_s^{i_s} \tag{4.1}$$

if and only if

$$m_j | (i_j - 1), \text{ and } m_k | i_k \text{ for each } k \le s \text{ with } k \ne j. \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Recall that Condition 3.1 states that $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ are primitive m_1-th, $\dots, m_s$-th roots of unity, respectively, and $m_1, \dots, m_s$ are mutually distinct primes (and thus all $m_j \ge 2$). Thus, (4.2) implies (4.1) and we can write

$$\lambda_k = e^{\frac{2\pi p_k i}{m_k}}, k = 1, \dots, s,$$

where $i = \sqrt{-1}$ and each p_k is a positive integer with $p_k < m_k$.

For given $j \le s$, if (4.1) holds, then putting $n_j = i_j - 1$ and putting $n_k = i_k$ for each $k \le s$ with $k \ne j$, we have

$$\lambda_1^{n_1} \dots \lambda_s^{n_s} = e^{2\pi i \left(\frac{p_1 n_1}{m_1} + \cdots + \frac{p_s n_s}{m_s} \right)} = 1,$$

and then

$$l = \frac{p_1 n_1}{m_1} + \cdots + \frac{p_s n_s}{m_s}$$

is an integer, and then for each subscript t with $1 \le t \le s$ we have

$$p_t n_t \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \ne t}}^{s} m_j + m_t \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k \ne t}}^{s} p_k n_k \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \ne k,t}}^{s} m_j = l \prod_{j=1}^{s} m_j.$$

For each $t \le s$, since p_t is a positive integer with $p_t < m_t$ and $m_1, \dots, m_s$ are distinct primes, $p_t \prod_{j=1, j \ne t}^{s} m_j$ and m_t are relatively prime. Thus, m_t divides n_t. This completes the proof. □

Corollary 4.1. *Let $f : \Delta^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be a holomorphic mapping with $f(0) = 0$ and assume:*

($\mathfrak{A}$). *$Df(0) = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s, \mu_{s+1}, \dots, \mu_n)$ is a diagonal matrix.*

($\mathfrak{B}$). *$\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ satisfy Condition 3.1.*

($\mathfrak{C}$). *For any n-tuple $(i_1, \dots, i_s, i_{s+1}, \dots, i_n)$ of nonnegative integers,*

$$\lambda_j = \lambda_1^{i_1} \dots \lambda_s^{i_s} \mu_{s+1}^{i_{s+1}} \dots \mu_n^{i_n} \Longrightarrow i_{s+1} = \cdots = i_n = 0, \text{ for each } j \le s.$$

Then, there exists a biholomorphic coordinate transformation in the form of

$$(y_1, \dots, y_n) = H(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_1, \dots, x_n) + \text{higher terms}, \tag{4.3}$$

in a neighborhood of the origin, such that the components of $g = (g_1, \dots, g_n) = H^{-1} \circ f \circ H$ *are in the form of*

$$\begin{cases} g_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = & \lambda_j x_j + x_j \sum_{i=1}^{s} b_{ji} x_i^{m_i} + o_j, \ j = 1, \dots, s, \\ g_r(x_1, \dots, x_n) = & \mu_r x_r + R_r, \ r = s+1, \dots, n, \end{cases}$$

in a neighborhood of the origin, where each b_{ji} *is a complex number, each* $o_j = o_j(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ *satisfies Condition 3.4 and each* $R_r = R_r(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ *satisfies Condition 3.5.*

Proof. By $(\mathfrak{A})$ and Lemma 4.1, there exists a biholomorphic coordinate transformation H in the form of (4.3) in a neighborhood of the origin, such that each component of $g = (g_1, \dots, g_n) = H^{-1} \circ f \circ H$ has the expression

$$g_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \lambda_j x_j + \sum_{i_1 + \cdots + i_n = 2}^{(m_1 \dots m_s)^2} c^j_{i_1 \dots i_s i_{s+1} \dots i_n} x_1^{i_1} \dots x_s^{i_s} x_{s+1}^{i_{s+1}} \dots x_n^{i_n} + o'_j \tag{4.4}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, s$, and

$$g_r(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \mu_r x_r + R_r, \text{ for } r = s+1, \dots, n,$$

in a neighborhood of the origin, where each o'_j is a power series in $x_1, \dots, x_n$ consisting of terms of degree $> (m_1 \dots m_s)^2$, each R_r is a power series in $x_1, \dots, x_n$ satisfying Condition 3.5, and the sum in (4.4) extends over all n-tuples $(i_1, \dots, i_n)$ of nonnegative integers with

$$2 \leq i_1 + \cdots + i_n \leq (m_1 \dots m_s)^2 \text{ and } \lambda_j = \lambda_1^{i_1} \dots \lambda_s^{i_s} \mu_{s+1}^{i_{s+1}} \dots \mu_n^{i_n}. \tag{4.5}$$

For each $j \leq s$ and any n-tuple $(i_1, \dots, i_n)$ that satisfies (4.5), by $(\mathfrak{C})$ we have $i_{s+1} = \cdots = i_n = 0$, and then by $(\mathfrak{B})$ and Lemma 4.2, we have $m_j | (i_j - 1)$ and $m_k | i_k$ for each $k \leq s$ with $k \neq j$. Thus, for each $j \leq s$, (4.4) precisely means that,

$$g_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \lambda_j x_j + x_j p_j(x_1^{m_1}, \dots, x_s^{m_s}) + o'_j,$$

where $p_j(x_1^{m_1}, \dots, x_s^{m_s})$ is a polynomial in $x_1^{m_1}, \dots, x_s^{m_s}$, and then we can write

$$g_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \lambda_j x_j + x_j \sum_{i=1}^{s} b_{ji} x_i^{m_i} + h_j(x_1^{m_1}, \dots, x_s^{m_s}) + o'_j,$$

where $h_j(x_1^{m_1}, \dots, x_s^{m_s})$ is a polynomial, in $x_1^{m_1}, \dots, x_s^{m_s}$, in the form of (3.2). This completes the proof. ☐

Lemma 4.3. *Let* $f : \overline{\Delta^n} \to \mathbb{C}^n$ *be a holomorphic mapping. Assume:*

(a) $Df(0) = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ *is a diagonal matrix.*

(b) $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ *satisfy Condition 3.1:* $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ *are primitive* m_1*-th*, $\dots, m_s$*-th roots of unity, respectively, and* $m_1, \dots, m_s$ *are mutually distinct primes.*

(c) The origin is an isolated fixed point of both f *and* $f^{m_1 \cdots m_s}$.

Then $P_{m_1 \dots m_s}(f, 0) > 0$.

Proof. It is clear that for the complex numbers $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$, the set of all $(n-s)$-tuples $(\mu_{s+1}, \dots, \mu_n)$ of complex numbers so that condition $(\mathfrak{C})$ in Corollary 4.1 fails is a subset of $\mathbb{C}^{n-s}$ with $2(n-s)$-Lebesgue measure zero. Therefore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist complex numbers $\mu_{s+1}, \dots, \mu_n$ such that

$$\sum_{k=s+1}^{n} |\mu_k - \lambda_k|^2 < \varepsilon^2, \tag{4.6}$$

that Condition 3.2 holds for $\mu_{s+1}, \dots, \mu_n$, and that condition $(\mathfrak{C})$ in Corollary 4.1 holds for the n-tuple $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s, \mu_{s+1}, \dots, \mu_n)$.

Let $f_\varepsilon(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ be the mapping obtained from $f(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ by just replacing the linear part of f with $(\lambda_1 z_1, \dots, \lambda_s z_s, \mu_{s+1} z_{s+1}, \dots, \mu_n z_n)$, say,

$$f_\varepsilon(z_1, \dots, z_n) - f(z_1, \dots, z_n) = (0, \dots, 0, (\mu_{s+1} - \lambda_{s+1})\, z_{s+1}, \dots, (\mu_n - \lambda_n)\, z_n).$$

Then f_ε satisfies all the assumptions in Corollary 4.1 with

$$Df_\varepsilon(0) = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s, \mu_{s+1}, \dots, \mu_n),$$

and then there exists a biholomorphic coordinate transformation in the form of

$$(z_1, \dots, z_n) = H_\varepsilon(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_1, \dots, x_n) + \text{higher terms}, \ (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \overline{B},$$

where B is a ball centered at the origin, such that $g_\varepsilon = (g_1, \dots, g_n) = H_\varepsilon^{-1} \circ f_\varepsilon \circ H_\varepsilon$ has the expression

$$\begin{cases} g_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = & \lambda_j x_j + x_j \sum_{i=1}^{s} b_{ji} x_i^{m_i} + o_j, \ j = 1, \dots, s, \\ g_r(x_1, \dots, x_n) = & \mu_r x_r + R_r, \ r = s+1, \dots, n, \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

on $\overline{B}$, where each b_{ji} is a constant, each o_j is a power series satisfying Condition 3.4 and each R_r is a power series satisfying Condition 3.5.

g_ε is in the form of (3.1), together with the associated Conditions 3.1, 3.2, 3.4 and 3.5. Condition 3.3 may not be satisfied, but for any fixed g_ε, by just modifying the numbers b_{ji} in (4.7) slightly, we can construct a sequence $\{g_{k,\varepsilon}\} \subset \mathcal{O}(\overline{B}, \mathbb{C}^n)$, uniformly converging to g_ε on $\overline{B}$ as $k \to \infty$, such that each $g_{k,\varepsilon}$ is in the form of (3.1) together with all Conditions 3.1—3.5.

Now, Proposition 3.1 applies to each $g_{k,\varepsilon}$, and then we have

$$P_{m_1 \dots m_s}(g_{k,\varepsilon}, 0) > 0,$$

which implies, by Lemma 2.8, that

$$P_{m_1 \dots m_s}(H_\varepsilon \circ g_{k,\varepsilon} \circ H_\varepsilon^{-1}, 0) > 0.$$

But it is clear that, for fixed f_ε and H_ε, $H_\varepsilon \circ g_{k,\varepsilon} \circ H_\varepsilon^{-1}$ converges to $H_\varepsilon \circ g_\varepsilon \circ H_\varepsilon^{-1} = f_\varepsilon$, uniformly in a neighborhood of the origin as $k \to \infty$. Thus by Corollary 2.4

$$P_{m_1 \dots m_s}(f_\varepsilon, 0) > 0, \tag{4.8}$$

provided that the origin is an isolated fixed point of both f_ε and $f_\varepsilon^{m_1 \cdots m_s}$. By (4.6), f_ε converges to f uniformly in a neighborhood of the origin as $\varepsilon \to 0$, and then by (c) and Lemma 2.1, for sufficiently small ε, the origin is an isolated fixed point of both f_ε and $f_\varepsilon^{m_1 \cdots m_s}$. Hence, (4.8) holds for sufficiently small ε, and hence by (c), the convergence of f_ε and by Corollary 2.4,

$$P_{m_1 \dots m_s}(f, 0) > 0.$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.4. *Let* $\mathbf{X}$ *be a set, let* $f : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{X}$ *be a mapping and let* m *be a positive integer. If* p *is a point in* $\mathbf{X}$ *such that* $f^m(p) = p$*, then* p *is a periodic point of* f *and the period is a factor of* m*.*

Proof. This follows from the definition of periods in Section 1.1. □

Lemma 4.5. *Let* $\mathbf{X}$ *be a set, let* $f : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{X}$ *be a mapping and let* m^* *and* n_1 *be positive integers. If* p *is a point in* $\mathbf{X}$ *such that*

$$f^{m^* n_1}(p) = p, \tag{4.9}$$

and p *is a periodic point of* f^{m^*} *of period* n_1*, then* p *is a periodic point of* f *with period* mn_1*, where* m *is a factor of* m^**.*

Proof. Assume that p is a periodic point of f of period L, say, L is the least positive integer such that $f^L(p) = p$. Then, $L | (m^* n_1)$ by (4.9) and Lemma 4.4, and then L can be factorized into $L = mn'$, where m and n' are factors of m^* and n_1, respectively.

Putting $d = m^*/m$, we have

$$p = f^L(p) = f^{dL}(p) = f^{dmn'}(p) = f^{m^* n'}(p) = (f^{m^*})^{n'}(p),$$

and then $n' \geq n_1$, for n_1 is the least positive integer such that $(f^{m^*})^{n_1}(p) = p$. Therefore, $n' = n_1$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.6. *Let* $\mathbf{X}$ *be a set, let* $n_1, \ldots, n_s$ *be mutually distinct primes, let* $r_1, \ldots, r_s$ *be positive integers, let* $f : \mathbf{X} \to \mathbf{X}$ *be a mapping and assume that* $p \in \mathbf{X}$ *is a periodic point of* $f^{n_1^{r_1-1} \ldots n_s^{r_s-1}}$ *with period* $n_1 \ldots n_s$*. Then* p *is a periodic point of* f *with period* $n_1^{r_1} \ldots n_s^{r_s}$*.*

Proof. By the hypothesis, we have

$$f^{n_1^{r_1} \ldots n_s^{r_s}}(p) = \left(f^{n_1^{r_1-1} \ldots n_s^{r_s-1}}\right)^{n_1 \ldots n_s}(p) = p.$$

Thus, p is a periodic point of f and we assume that the period is L. Then by Lemma 4.4, L divides $n_1^{r_1} \ldots n_s^{r_s}$.

Since $n_1, \ldots, n_s$ are distinct primes, we have $L = n_1^{r_1'} \ldots n_s^{r_s'}$ for some nonnegative integers $r_1', \ldots, r_s'$ with $r_j' \leq r_j$ for all $j \leq s$. We must show that $r_j' = r_j$ for all $j \leq s$.

Otherwise, $r_j' < r_j$ for some $j \leq s$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $r_1' < r_1$. Then $n_1^{r_1-1} n_2^{r_2} \ldots n_s^{r_s}$ is a multiple of L and then

$$f^{n_1^{r_1-1} n_2^{r_2} \ldots n_s^{r_s}}(p) = p,$$

in other words,

$$\left(f^{n_1^{r_1-1} n_2^{r_2-1} \ldots n_s^{r_s-1}}\right)^{n_2 \ldots n_s}(p) = p,$$

which contradicts the assumption that p is a periodic point of $f^{n_1^{r_1-1} n_2^{r_2-1} \ldots n_s^{r_s-1}}$ with period $n_1 n_2 \ldots n_s$ (note that all n_j are distinct primes and then all $n_j \geq 2$). This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.7. *Assume that* $m_1, \ldots, m_s$ *are positive integers such that for each* $j \leq s$*,*

$$M = [m_1, \ldots, m_s] > [m_1, \ldots, m_{j-1}, m_{j+1}, \ldots, m_s].$$

Then there exist factors M^* *and* M^{**} *of* M*, mutually distinct primes* $n_1, \dots, n_s$*, and positive integers* $r_1, \dots, r_s$*,* $n'_1, \dots, n'_s$*, such that for each* $j \le s$*,*

$$n_j^{r_j} | m_j \text{ but } n_j^{r_j+1} \nmid m_j, \text{ and } n_j^{r_j} \nmid m_k \text{ for all } k \le s \text{ with } k \ne j, \tag{4.10}$$

$$M = M^* \prod_{j=1}^{s} n_j = M^{**} \prod_{j=1}^{s} n_j^{r_j}, \tag{4.11}$$

and

$$\frac{M^*}{m_j} = \frac{n'_j}{n_j} \text{ with } (n_j, n'_j) = 1, \; j = 1, \dots, s. \tag{4.12}$$

Here, (n_j, n'_j) *denotes the greatest common divisor of* n_j *and* n'_j*.*

Proof. By the assumption, for each $j \le s$, there exists a prime n_j and a positive integer r_j such that (4.10) holds. Then, it is clear that all the primes $n_1, \dots, n_s$ are distinct each other. Therefore, $n_1^{r_1} \dots n_s^{r_s}$ is a factor of $M = [m_1, \dots, m_s]$, and then $M^* = [m_1, \dots, m_s] n_1^{-1} \dots n_s^{-1}$ and $M^{**} = [m_1, \dots, m_s] n_1^{-r_1} \dots n_s^{-r_s}$ are positive integers satisfying (4.11).

It remains to show the existence of $n'_1, \dots, n'_s$ so that (4.12) holds. By (4.10), for each $j \le s$, there exists a positive integer m_j^{**} such that

$$m_j = m_j^{**} n_1^{r_{j1}} \dots n_s^{r_{js}} \text{ with } r_{jj} = r_j, \tag{4.13}$$

and

$$(m_j^{**}, n_1 \dots n_s) = 1. \tag{4.14}$$

Then, again by (4.10), we have for each $j \le s$,

$$r_j = r_{jj} > r_{kj}, \text{ for each } k \le s \text{ with } k \ne j. \tag{4.15}$$

Therefore, considering that $n_1, \dots, n_s$ are mutually distinct primes, by (4.13)–(4.15) we have

$$M = [m_1, \dots, m_s] = [m_1^{**}, \dots, m_s^{**}] \prod_{j=1}^{s} n_j^{r_{jj}}.$$

This implies that $M^* = [m_1^{**}, \dots, m_s^{**}] \prod_{j=1}^{s} n_j^{r_{jj}-1}$, and then, for each $k \le s$, by (4.13) we have

$$\frac{M^*}{m_k} = \frac{[m_1^{**}, \dots, m_s^{**}] \prod_{j=1}^{s} n_j^{r_{jj}-1}}{m_k^{**} n_1^{r_{k1}} \dots n_s^{r_{ks}}} = \frac{n'_k}{n_k}$$

where

$$n'_k = \frac{[m_1^{**}, \dots, m_s^{**}]}{m_k^{**}} \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \ne k}}^{s} n_j^{r_{jj} - r_{kj} - 1},$$

which is a positive integer by (4.15). Since $n_1, \dots, n_s$ are mutually distinct primes, by the previous equality and (4.14) we have $(n'_k, n_k) = 1$. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Assume that $f : \Delta^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ is a holomorphic mapping that satisfies conditions (A)–(C) stated in Proposition 4.1:

(A). $Df(0)$ is a diagonal matrix.

(B). $Df(0)$ has eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s$ that are primitive m_1-th, $\ldots, m_s$-th roots of unity, respectively.

(C). The origin is an isolated fixed point of both f and f^M, where $M = [m_1, \cdots, m_s]$.

We shall show that

$$P_M(f, 0) > 0. \tag{4.16}$$

Since $P_M(f, 0)$ is completely determined by the local behavior of f at the origin, we may assume that f is holomorphic on $\overline{\Delta^n}$, by shrinking Δ^n.

By Lemma 2.8, any linear coordinate transformation does not change $P_M(f, 0)$. Therefore, it is without loss of generality to rewrite the conditions (A) and (B) to be the following conditions (D)–(F).

(D). $Df(0) = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s, \lambda_{s+1}, \ldots, \lambda_n)$ is a diagonal matrix.

(E). $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s$ are primitive m_1-th, $\ldots, m_s$-th roots of unity, respectively.

(F). $m_1, \ldots, m_s$ satisfy the assumption in Lemma 4.7.

Then all conclusions in Lemma 4.7 hold: there exist factors M^* and M^{**} of M, mutually distinct primes $n_1, \ldots, n_s$, positive integers $r_1, \ldots, r_s$, $n'_1, \ldots, n'_s$, such that (4.10)–(4.12) hold. Therefore, the following condition also hold.

(G). If L is a positive integer that is the least common multiple of some numbers in $\{m_1, \ldots, m_s\}$ and is divided by $n_1^{r_1} \ldots n_s^{r_s}$, then $L = M$.

Then, by (C), (D) and Lemma 2.1, for any positive number ε, by just modifying $\lambda_{s+1}, \ldots, \lambda_n$ of the linear part of f at the origin, we can construct a holomorphic mapping $F : \overline{\Delta^n} \to \mathbb{C}^n$ such that the origin is an isolated fixed point of both F and F^M,

$$||F - f||_{\overline{\Delta^n}} = \max_{x \in \overline{\Delta^n}} |F(x) - f(x)| < \varepsilon, \tag{4.17}$$

and

$$DF(0) = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s, \mu_{s+1}, \ldots, \mu_n), \tag{4.18}$$

where $\mu_{s+1}, \ldots, \mu_n$ are complex numbers with

$$|\mu_r| \neq 1, r = s + 1, \ldots, n. \tag{4.19}$$

If we can prove $P_M(F, 0) > 0$, then by (4.17), the arbitrariness of ε and Corollary 2.4, we shall have (4.16). In the rest of the proof, we shall show $P_M(F, 0) > 0$.

Since the origin is an isolated fixed point of F and F^M, there exists a ball $B \subset \Delta^n$ centered at the origin with $\overline{B} \subset \Delta^n$, such that F, F^{M^*} and F^M are well defined on $\overline{B}$, that

$$F^k(\overline{B}) \subset \Delta^n \text{ for all } k = 1, \ldots, M, \tag{4.20}$$

and that

$$\mathrm{Fix}(F|_{\overline{B}}) = \mathrm{Fix}(F^{M^*}|_{\overline{B}}) = \mathrm{Fix}(F^M|_{\overline{B}}) = \{0\}. \tag{4.21}$$

It is clear by (4.12) and (E) that $\lambda_1^{M^*}, \ldots, \lambda_s^{M^*}$ are primitive n_1-th, $\ldots, n_s$-th roots of unity, respectively, and since $n_1, \ldots, n_s$ are distinct primes, $\lambda_1^{M^*}, \ldots, \lambda_s^{M^*}$ satisfy Condition 3.1 for the s-tuple $(n_1, \ldots, n_s)$. On the other hand, by (4.18),

$$DF^{M^*}(0) = (\lambda_1^{M^*}, \ldots, \lambda_s^{M^*}, \mu_{s+1}^{M^*}, \ldots, \mu_n^{M^*}).$$

Therefore, by (4.21), Lemma 4.3 applies to F^{M^*}, and then

$$P_{n_1\ldots n_s}(F^{M^*},0)>0. \tag{4.22}$$

By (4.21) and Lemma 2.3, there exists a sequence $\{F_j\}\subset\mathcal{O}(\overline{\Delta^n},\mathbb{C}^n)$, converging to F uniformly, such that all fixed points of F_j^M in $\overline{B}$ are hyperbolic.

By (4.21) and Corollary 2.4, if we can prove the following conclusion (H), we shall obtain the inequality $P_M(F,0)>0$ immediately.

(H). For sufficiently large j, each F_j has a periodic point p_j of period M converging to the origin as $j\to\infty$.

For sufficiently large j, $F_j^{M^*}$ is well defined on $\overline{B}$ by (4.20), and uniformly converges to F^{M^*} on $\overline{B}$. Thus by (4.21), (4.22) and Corollary 2.1 (iii), for sufficiently large j, $F_j^M=(F_j^{M^*})^{n_1\cdots n_s}$ has no fixed point on ∂B and

$$P_{n_1\ldots n_s}(F_j^{M^*}|_{\overline{B}})=P_{n_1\ldots n_s}(F^{M^*},0)>0.$$

Then, by Lemma 2.4 (ii), for sufficiently large j, $F_j^{M^*}$ has a periodic point $p_j\in B$ of period $n_1\ldots n_s$. And furthermore, by (4.21), by the formula

$$F_j^M(p_j)=F_j^{M^*n_1\ldots n_s}(p_j)=\left(F_j^{M^*}\right)^{n_1\ldots n_s}(p_j)=p_j, \tag{4.23}$$

and by the fact that F_j^M uniformly converges to F^M on $\overline{B}$, we have

$$p_j\to 0 \text{ as } j\to\infty. \tag{4.24}$$

Thus, by (4.11), Lemma 4.6 and by the formula

$$\left(F_j^{M^{**}}\right)^{n_1^{r_1-1}\ldots n_s^{r_s-1}}=F_j^{M^{**}n_1^{r_1-1}\ldots n_s^{r_s-1}}=F_j^{M^*},$$

p_j is a periodic point of $F_j^{M^{**}}$ with period $n_1^{r_1}\ldots n_s^{r_s}$. On the other hand, by (4.11) and (4.23) we also have

$$F_j^{M^{**}n_1^{r_1}\ldots n_s^{r_s}}(p_j)=F_j^M(p_j)=p_j.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 4.5, p_j is a periodic point of F_j of period $L_j=l_jn_1^{r_1}\ldots n_s^{r_s}$, where l_j is a positive integer dividing M^{**}.

Since l_j is a bounded sequence of positive integers, by taking subsequence, we may assume that all l_j equal to a fixed positive integer l, say, for each j, p_j is a periodic point of F_j of period L with

$$L=ln_1^{r_1}\ldots n_s^{r_s}. \tag{4.25}$$

Now that each F_j has a periodic point p_j of period L satisfying (4.24) and F_j converges to F uniformly, by Corollary 2.5, the linear part of F at the origin has a periodic point of period L, and then by (E), (4.18), (4.19) and Lemma 2.5, L is the least common multiple of some numbers of $m_1,\ldots,m_s$, and hence by (G) and (4.25), we have

$$L=M=[m_1,\ldots,m_s],$$

say, p_j is a periodic point of F_j of period M, and then the statement (H) is proved. This completes the proof of Proposition 4.1. □

5. **Proof of Theorem 1.1**

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By shrinking Δ^n, we may assume, without loss of generality, that f is holomorphic on $\overline{\Delta^n}$ and the origin is the unique fixed point of both f and f^M in $\overline{\Delta^n}$. Since the conclusion in Theorem 1.1 trivially holds for $M = 1$, we also assume $M > 1$.

If

$$P_M(f, 0) > 0, \tag{5.1}$$

then by Corollary 2.4 (c), there exist a ball $B \subset \Delta^n$ centered at the origin and a sequence $\{f_j\} \subset \mathcal{O}(\overline{B}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ such that f_j converges to $f|_{\overline{B}}$ uniformly and each f_j has a periodic point p_j of period M with $p_j \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$. Thus, by Corollary 2.5 the linear part of f at the origin has a periodic point of period M. This proves the necessity in Theorem 1.1.

To prove the sufficiency, assume that the linear part of f at the origin has a periodic point of period M. Then, by Lemma 2.5 there exist mutually distinct positive integers $m_1, \dots, m_s,\ s \le n$, such that $M = [m_1, \dots, m_s]$ and $Df(0)$ has eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ that are primitive m_1-th, $\dots, m_s$-th roots of unity, respectively.

Thus it follows from Corollary 2.1, by modifying the linear part of f slightly, we can construct a sequence of holomorphic mappings $f_j : \overline{\Delta^n} \to \mathbb{C}^n$ converging to f uniformly, such that for each j, the origin is an isolated fixed point of both f_j and f_j^M, $Df_j(0)$ can be diagonalized and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ are still eigenvalues of $Df_j(0)$. This is possible because we have assumed that $m_1, \dots, m_s$ are mutually distinct, which implies that $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ are different from each other.

Then, there exists a sequence of invertible linear transformations H_j such that

$$D(H_j^{-1} \circ f_j \circ H_j)(0) = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s, \mu_{j,s+1}, \dots, \mu_{j,n})$$

is a diagonal matrix. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.8, the origin is still an isolated fixed point of both $H_j^{-1} \circ f_j \circ H_j$ and $(H_j^{-1} \circ f_j \circ H_j)^M$. Thus by Proposition 4.1, $P_M(H_j^{-1} \circ f_j \circ H_j, 0) > 0$, for $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ are primitive m_1-th, $\dots$, m_s-th roots of unity and $M = [m_1, \dots, m_s]$. This implies, by Lemma 2.8, that

$$P_M(f_j, 0) > 0.$$

Hence by the convergence of f_j and Corollaries 2.4 we have $P_M(f, 0) > 0$. This completes the proof of the sufficiency. □

6. Appendix

Let U be a bounded open subset of the real vector space $\mathbb{R}^n$ containing the origin, $g : \overline{U} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ a continuous mapping with an isolated fixed point at the origin and let B be an open ball in U centered at the origin such that g has no other fixed point in $\overline{B} \backslash \{0\}$. Then the local *Lefschetz fixed point index* $\mu_g(0)$ of g at the origin is defined to be the topology degree of the mapping

$$x \mapsto \frac{x - g(x)}{|x - g(x)|}$$

from the $(n-1)$-sphere ∂B into the unit $(n-1)$-sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$. If, in addition, g is a C^1 mapping, then

$$\mu_g(0) = \sum_{x \in B,\ x - g(x) = q} \text{sgn}\ \det(I - Dg(x)),$$

where $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a regular value (of the mapping $x \longmapsto x - g(x)$) that is sufficiently close to the origin, I is the $n \times n$ unit matrix and $Dg(x)$ is the differential of g at the origin, which is identified with the Jacobian matrix (see [9] and [11]).

If the fixed point set $\mathrm{Fix}(g)$ of g is a compact subset of U, then one can find a continuous mapping $f : \overline{U} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ sufficiently close to g such that $\mathrm{Fix}(f)$ is finite and is contained in U, and then one can define the global Lefschetz fixed point index of g to be

$$L(g) = \sum_{p \in U,\ f(p)=p} \mu_f(p).$$

This number is independent of f, when f is close to g enough.

If for a positive integer M, the origin is an isolated fixed point of both g and g^M, then the local Dold's index

$$P_M(g,0) = \sum_{\tau \subset P(M)} (-1)^{\#\tau} \mu_{g^{M:\tau}}(0)$$

is well defined.

If the fixed point set $\mathrm{Fix}(g^M)$ of g^M is a compact subset in U, then for each factor m of M, since the fixed point set $\mathrm{Fix}(g^m)$ is a closed subset of $\mathrm{Fix}(g^M)$, $\mathrm{Fix}(g^m)$ is again a compact subset of U, and then the Lefschetz fixed point index $L(g^m)$ is well defined, and so is the Dold's index

$$P_M(g) = \sum_{\tau \subset P(M)} (-1)^{\#\tau} L(g^{M:\tau}).$$

This number is studied by several authors (see [6], [7], [12] and [13].) The importance of the number $P_M(g)$ is that, when $P_M(g,0) \neq 0$, any continuous mapping $g_1 : U \to \mathbb{R}^n$ sufficiently close to g has periodic points near the origin with period M when M is odd, and period M or $M/2$ when M is even, provided that each fixed point of g_1^M near the origin is of index $+1$ or -1 (see [7]).

When g is a holomorphic mapping from $\overline{U} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ into $\mathbb{C}^n$, the above definitions for $\mu_g(p), P_M(g,p)$ and $P_M(g)$ agree with the definitions in Sections 1 and 2 (see [7] and [9]).

References

[1] Arrowsmith, D. K. & Place, C. M., An introduction to dynamical systems, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.

[2] Buzzard, Gregery T., Kupka-Smale theorem for automorphisms of $\mathbb{C}^n$, Duke Math. J. 93, no. 3 (1998), 487–503.

[3] Chow, S-N, Mallet-Paret, J. & Yorke, J. A., A periodic orbit index which is a bifurcation invariant, Geometric dynamics (Rio de Janeiro, 1981), Lecture Notes in Math., 1007, Springer, Berlin, 1983, 109–131 (MR 85d:58058).

[4] Chirka, E. M., Complex analytic sets, Translated from the Russian by R. A. M. Hoksbergen, Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series), 46. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht (1989).

[5] Cronin, J., Analytic functional mappings, Ann. of Math. (2) 58, (1953). 175–181 (MR 15,234a)

[6] Dold, A., Fixed point indices of iterated maps, Invent. Math. 74 (1983), no. 3, 419–435 (MR 85c:54077).

[7] Fagella, N., Llibre, J., Periodic points of holomorphic maps via Lefschetz numbers, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 352 (2000), no. 10, 4711–4730 (MR2001b:55003).

[8] Hardy, G. H. & Wright, W. M., An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers, 5th ed. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, (1979).

[9] Lloyd, N. G., Degree theory, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, No. 73. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York-Melbourne, 1978 (MR 58 #12558).

[10] Milnor, J., Dynamics in one complex variable, Introductory lectures, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, 1999.

[11] Shub, M., & Sullivan, D. A remark on the Lefschetz fixed point formula for differentiable maps, Topology 13 (1974), 189–191 (MR 50 #3274).

[12] Steinlein, H., Ein Satz über den Leray-Schauderschen Abbildungsgrad, (German) Math. Z. 126 (1972), 176–208 (MR 47#5667).

[13] Zabreĭko, P. P. & Krasnosel'skiĭ, M. A., Iterations of operators, and fixed points. (Russian) Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 196 (1971), 1006–1009; Soviet Math. Dokl. 12 (1971), 294–298 (MR 47 #4082).

[14] Zhang, G. Y., Bifurcations of periodic points of holomorphic maps from $\mathbb{C}^2$ into $\mathbb{C}^2$. Proc. London Math. Soc., 79(3) (1999), 353–380 (MR 2000f:32027).

[15] Zhang, G. Y., Multiplicities of fixed points of holomorphic maps in several complex variables, Sci. China Ser. A 44 (2001), no. 3, 330–337 (MR 2002b:37026).

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, P. R. China

E-mail address: `gyzhang@math.tsinghua.edu.cn; gyzhang@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn`